


In re Application of DURR, et al.  
Application No. 09/801,951

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested. An Office action mailed February 26, 2004 is pending in the application. Applicants have carefully considered the Office action and the references of record. In the Office action, claims 13-19 and 31-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and claims 1-5, 6-12, 20-24, 25-30 and 40-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. In this response to the Office action, claims 1, 11-13, 20, 31 and 38 have been amended. Therefore, claims 1-45 are pending in the application. The following diagram depicts the relationship between the independent and dependent claims.



In re Application of DURR, et al.  
Application No. 09/801,951

#### Examiner Interview and Rejections of the Independent Claims

Applicants thank Examiners Tang and Nguyen-Ba for the courtesy of a telephone interview on April 15, 2004 to discuss the Office action mailed February 26, 2004. Applicants were represented by Messrs. Dodson and Conklin. During the interview, proposed amendments to independent claims 1, 12, 13, 20, 31 and 38 were discussed with respect to the teachings of J. Richter, "Programming Applications for Microsoft Windows," Microsoft Press, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., 1999, pages 794-800 (hereinafter *Richter*), U.S. Patent No. 6,330,569 to Baisley et al. (hereinafter *Baisley*) and U.S. Patent No. 6,513,133 to Campbell et al. (hereinafter *Campbell*). As recorded in the Interview Summary (paper number 5), agreement was reached during the interview that the proposed amendments, which are formally presented herein, distinguish the claimed invention from the teachings of *Richter*, *Baisley*, and *Campbell* alone or in combination.

#### Rejections of the Dependent Claims

Each of claims 1, 13, 20, 31 and 38 is in independent form, whereas all of the remaining claims depend directly or indirectly on one of these five independent claims. The dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons that the five independent claims 1, 13, 20, 31 and 38 are allowable in that the dependent claims incorporate the features of the independent claims. Nevertheless, the dependent claims further define subject matter not shown or rendered obvious by the prior art of record. Because the independent claims are allowable over the applied prior art, applicants do not believe remarks addressing this further subject matter are necessary herein.

#### Objection to the Abstract

The abstract of the disclosure is amended herein to bring it into compliance with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.72(b). In compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(f), the amendment does not add new matter.

In re Application of DURR, et al.  
Application No. 09/801,951

CONCLUSION

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Richard P. Dodson, Reg. No. 52,824  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.  
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900  
180 North Stetson  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780  
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)  
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: May 26, 2004